REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-11 and 13-20 are all the claims pending in the application. Previously, claims 4 and 12 were canceled without prejudice or disclaimer. By this Amendment, Applicant editorially amends claims 1, 7, 16-19 and adds new claims 21-22 to clarify the invention. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and allowance of claims 1-3, 5-11, and 13-22 are respectfully requested at least in view of the following remarks.

I. Summary of the Office Action

Claims 5 and 14 are allowable. Claims 1-3, 6-11, 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)[1].

II. Request for Telephonic Interview

According to the Examiner's instructions, Applicant hereby formally requests a telephonic interview. Since the Examiner requested that Applicant formally requests the Interview in the Amendment, the Examiner is respectfully requested to contact Applicant's Representative to set up the interview.

III. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 15-20

Claims 1-3, 6-11 and 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,167,464 to Kretschmann (hereinafter "Kretschmann") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,879,092 to Brannan (hereinafter "Brannan"). Applicant respectfully traverses this

[1] Although the Examiner did not explicitly reject claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a), he provided grounds for rejection. Therefore, Applicant assumes that the Examiner also intended to reject claims 7-11 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) based on Kretschmann in view of Brannan.

rejection because the references fail to teach or suggest all of the elements as set forth and arranged in the claims.

Claim 1 recites: "in the case of the contemporaneous reception of a plurality of different signals transmitted by different transmitters of different installation parts, different priorities are automatically assigned to each of the plurality of different signals" and claim 7 similarly recites: "in the case of the contemporaneous reception of a plurality of different signals from different transmitters of different installation parts, automatically assigns a different priority to each of the plurality of different signals."

The Examiner acknowledges that Kretschmann does not teach the above-noted unique feature of claims 1 and 7, but contends that Brannan does. *See* page 6 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's interpretation of the Brannan reference.

Brannan relates to a system that indicates fault conditions in an automated banking machine journal printer. *See* Abstract. Specifically, Brannan discloses a first detector, operated "to detect movement of the paper" (*see* col. 4, lines 5-6) and a second detector "operative to provide a signal when the diameter or size of the [paper] supply has fallen to a predetermined level" (*i.e.*, when the paper is low). *See* col. 4, lines 11-16. "[A] Processor is programmed to provide fault signals when a combination of certain conditions are detected in accordance with the programming of the processor." *See* col. 4, lines 19-22. The conditions include signals from the detectors and from the printer, the latter indicating, for example that "the printer is attempting to print." *See* col. 4, lines 24-35. In other words, in order to generate a paper jam signal, for

example, the processor evaluates the condition of the first and the second detector and the printer's attempt to print several lines.

Brannan's FIG. 6 shows "a flow chart of the computer program executed by the processor of the electronic circuit used in the fault indicating apparatus." *See* col. 5, lines 6-8. The flow chart in Brannan's FIG. 6 clearly shows that the conditions for generating a fault signal, such as, for example, "Paper Low Signal", "Paper Out Signal" and "Paper Jam Signal," are determined by sequentially detecting respective conditions.

For example,

> At a step 86, the counter is checked to determine if the number of lines that have been printed is equal to a set number . . . At a step 88, the processor checks to determine if there has been a change in signal from detector 70. This would indicate that the spindle has rotated . . . A step 94 is then executed to check if paper is sensed by second detector 78.

See col. 8, lines 15-17, lines 24-27 and lines 30-32. That is, in the above example, the processor in Brannan sequentially checks if the printer attempts to print, and if it does, if the paper has moved and thereafter if paper has been sensed.

However, Brannan does not disclose or suggest: "in the case of the contemporaneous reception of a plurality of different signals transmitted by different transmitters of different installation parts, different priorities are automatically assigned to each of the plurality of different signals," as recited in claims 1 and 7.

The Examiner contends that signals from the first and second detectors correspond to the "plurality of different signals transmitted by transmitters in different installations," as recited in

claims 1 and 7. *See* page 6 of the Office Action. The Examiner further alleges that different priorities are automatically assigned to each of the plurality of signals by generating fault signal, wherein "only the most severe paper jams that trigger signals indicating a malfunction in other components are generally detected by existing automated teller machines," citing Brannan's col. 2, lines 7-21. *See* page 6 of the Office Action. In other words, according to the Examiner, Brannan's fault signals represent priorities and these priorities are assigned to the different fault conditions. Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's position.

Brannan does not disclose or suggest a contemporaneous reception of a plurality of different signals, as recited in claims 1 and 7. As discussed above, signals from the first and the second detectors, and also from the printer, are not received contemporaneously by the processor. Although the detectors might detect conditions and provide signals continuously, these signals are only received, when requested by the processor. As discussed above, the processor sequentially (and not contemporaneously) requests, *i.e.,* receives the signals from the detectors.

In addition, if, for the sake of argument, Brannan's fault signals would be interpreted as a plurality of signals that would correspond to the plurality of different signals according to claims 1 and 7, Brannan's FIG. 6 clearly shows, that it is impossible to generate more than one fault signal at the same time because each fault signal represents a certain combination of fault conditions. As a result, fault condition signals in Brannan are not contemporaneously received. As a consequence, Brannan does not teach a contemporaneous reception of a plurality of different signals, as recited in claims 1 and 7.

Furthermore, even assuming, *arguendo*, that the signals from the detectors in Brannan are contemporaneously received, Brannan does not disclose or suggest that different priorities are automatically assigned to each of these signals. In fact, Brannan is silent about automatically assigning priorities to signals. However, even under the Examiner's broad interpretation of the fault signals as priorities, these fault signals are not assigned to each the conditions or signals from the first and the second detectors in Brannan. Instead, fault signals in Brannan are provided only "when a combination of certain conditions (*i.e.*, signals from the printer and the first and second detectors) are detected." *See* col. 4, lines 20-23. In other words, in Brannan fault signals, that correspond priorities, are, if at all, assigned to all of the signals from the printer and the first and second detectors such that these signal would have the same priority if certain conditions are met. By contrast, "in the case of the contemporaneous reception of a plurality of different signals transmitted by transmitters in different installation parts, different priorities are automatically assigned to each of the plurality of signals," as recited in claims 1 and 7.

As a result, Kretschmann in view of Brannan does not disclose or suggest all of the elements as set forth and arranged in independent claims 1 and 7. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of claims 1 and 7 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be reconsidered and withdrawn.

Since claims 2, 3, 6, 8-11, and 15-20 depend from claims 1 and 7, respectively, they are patentable at least by virtue of their dependencies.

In addition, claims 16-20 further define the unique operations set forth in the independent claims 1 and 7 and are patentable for additional reasons as detailed below.

Regarding claims 16 and 19, the Examiner contends that Brannan teaches assigning different priorities according to a significance ranking of faults or errors, as recited in claims 16 and 19. Specifically, the Examiner alleges that the above-noted feature of claims 16 and 19 is disclosed in Brannan, because "the most severe paper jams that trigger signals indicating a malfunction in other components are generally detected by existing automated teller machines." *See* page 8 of the Office Action. As discussed above, Brannan does not teach assigning different priorities to signals from different detectors *i.e.*, the first and second detectors. Therefore, there is not even a need to apply a significance ranking of faults or errors to the signals from the two detectors. For at least these additional exemplary reasons, claims 16 and 19 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Regarding claim 17, which recites: "configuring by operator priorities for said automatic assigning," the Examiner contends that "the 'paper jam' and 'malfunction' . . . should be necessarily defined (configured) by an operator/engineer." *See* page 8 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully disagrees. According to Brannan, "[s]uch paper jams go undetected until a visual inspection is made by a service technician." *See* col. 2, lines 19-21. Brannan is silent about any configuration of signals by the service technician. In Brannan's FIG. 6 there is no step provided in which a technician could assign priorities to signals. Accordingly, the ATM in Brannan is rather preconfigured by the manufacturer than configurable by a service technician. . For at least these additional exemplary reasons, claim 17 is patentable over the prior art of record.

Regarding claims 18 and 20, the Examiner merely asserts that the claims fail to further limit the independent claims. *See* page 3 of the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner misinterprets claims 18 and 20, because these claims indeed further limit claims 1 and 7, respectively. Specifically, claims 18 and 20 further require that different priorities are assigned only in the case of the contemporaneous reception of the plurality of different signals. Applicant submits that while Brannan fails to disclose assigning different priorities to different received signals (as discussed above), Brannan also fails to disclose or suggest that such different priorities are assigned only in the case of the contemporaneous reception of the plurality of different signals, as recited in claims 18 and 20. In other words, Brannan does not disclose or suggest the additional condition of when the priorities are to be assigned. For at least these additional exemplary reasons, claims 18 and 20 are patentable over the prior art of record.

Claim 13

Claim 13 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Kretschmann in view of Brannan and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,963.145 to Escobosa (hereinafter "Escobosa"). Claims 13 depends from claim 7. Escobosa does not remedy the deficiencies of Kretschmann and Brannan and claim 13 is thus patentable over Kretschmann, Brannan and Escobosa at least by virtue of its dependency from claim 7.

IV. New Claims

In order to provide more varied protection, Applicant adds claims 21 and 22. Support for the new added claims is found throughout the specification, *e.g.*, at page 5 of the specification.

Claims 21 and 22 are patentable by virtue of their dependency and for additional features set forth therein.

V. Conclusion

In view of the above, reconsideration and allowance of this application are now believed to be in order, and such actions are hereby solicited. **The Examiner is kindly requested to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number listed below to set up the interview.**

The USPTO is directed and authorized to charge all required fees, except for the Issue Fee and the Publication Fee, to Deposit Account No. 19-4880. Please also credit any overpayments to said Deposit Account.

Respectfully submitted,

Nataliya Dvorson
Registration No. 56,616

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
Telephone: (202) 293-7060
Facsimile: (202) 293-7860
WASHINGTON OFFICE
23373
CUSTOMER NUMBER

Date: July 17, 2008